



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,438	03/10/2004	John P. Godwin	PD-990228A	4478
20/991 7590 05/19/2008 THE DIRECTV GROUP, INC. PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION CA / LA1 / A109 2230 E. IMPERIAL HIGHWAY EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245				
EXAMINER				
PEREZ, ANGELICA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/19/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/797,438

**Applicant(s)**

GODWIN, JOHN P.

**Examiner**

Perez M. Angelica

**Art Unit**

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/18/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance:

(A) "...indicate whether the prior art cited in the related earlier application has been reviewed..."

In response to argument (A), the examiner wants to indicate that the prior art cited and arguments, in related application SN 09/587792, have been reviewed and considered.

(B) "the Eyer reference cannot be reasonably interpreted to be a repeater...it has no use in mobile applications, and does not re-transmit signals received from broadcasts angels...", "Eyer does not teach a repeater, and Marko teaches a repeater that does not filter programs on any basis".

The examiner would like to indicate that the Eyer reference teaches of at least a receiver and where the Marko reference complements the Eyes's invention by explicitly providing a repeater, as already indicated in the prior office action. Therefore, the combination of Eyer and Marko teaches of a terrestrial repeater (Marko, which repeats the satellite signals). (Eyer) further teaches (implicitly) where the signals are filtered by the receiver, so that they can be distributed "in the one of the plurality of local broadcast regions".

It would have been obvious to combine the Eyer's receiver with the Marko's repeater as one; e.g., **repeater receiver**, as claimed by the applicant, and obtain the same results, e.g., distributing filtered "media programs", "in the one of the plurality of local broadcast regions".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 39-54 and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyer et al. (Eyer, US Patent no.: 6,160 545 A) in view of Marko et al. (Marko, US006347216B1).

Regarding claims 39, 45, 47 and 52, Eyer teaches a repeater (figure 1, item 130, where it transfer information form other sources; thus, repeater), comprising: a receiver (figure 1, items 120 and 150, where it receives information form satellite 100 through transmitter 110 and from CATV 140; column 21, lines 5-7), disposed in one of a plurality of local broadcast regions within a national broadcast region (column 6, lines 59-64, where the IRD is in a local region that are within the national broadcast region), the repeater receiver for receiving a signal transmitted by a satellite including national media programs intended for reception in the national broadcast region (figure 1, item 120, receives global and local IPG data sent from satellite 100) and regional media programs (columns 6 and 8, lines 25-29 and 43-50, where the IRD receives regional media programs); a processor for filtering the signal to pass only the regional media programs intended for reception in the one of the plurality of local broadcast regions from the regional media programs (columns 6 and 8, lines 59-64 and 43-50, respectively) by comparing identifiers included in the signal against a local broadcast

identifier of the terrestrial repeater (column 8 and 9, lines 43-67 and 1-10, respectively; where every IRD has a specified identifier) ;a repeater transmitter, communicatively coupled to the repeater receiver, for transmitting the passed regional media programs intended for reception in the one of the plurality of local broadcast regions (figure 1, item 110, where given a broad interpretation to the language, the repeater transmitter can be the transmitter from the satellite, which act as repeaters. In addition, the claim language does not indicate if the regional media programs refer to the filtered programs).

Eyer does not specifically teach of a terrestrial repeater.

In related art concerning a method and system for providing geographic specific services in a satellite communications network, Marko teaches of a terrestrial repeater (column 2, lines 25-45, where the repeater receives the information from the satellite and repeats geographically specific information to users).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Eyer's localized delivery system with Marko's terrestrial repeater in order to transmit "geographically targeted data such as local weather forecasts, news, advertisements" to users, as taught by Marko.

Regarding claims 40 and 48, Eyer and Marko teach all the limitations of claims 39 and 47, respectively. Eyer further teaches where the repeater transmitter further transmits national media programs to receivers disposed in the local broadcast region (figure 1, items 1000 and 110, where "global" programming services are transmitted. In addition, the claim language does not indicate if the transmitter is transmitting the information directly; therefore, the prior art reads on it).

Regarding claims 41 and 49, Eyer and Marko teach all the imitations of claims 39 and 47, respectively. Eyer further teaches where the processor further stores and repeats regional media programs (column 9, lines 44-62, then it displays).

Regarding claims 42, 50 and 57, Eyer and Marko teach all the imitations of claims 39, 49 and 52, respectively. Eyer further teaches where the processor further stores and retransmits regional program guide information at a repetition rate (column 16, lines 34-54, e.g., "Triple\_Bundle\_Repetition\_Frequencies).

Regarding claims 43, 51 and 58, Eyer and Marko teach all the imitations of claims 42, 50 and 52, respectively. Eyer further teaches where the signal comprises media programs intended for reception in a second local broadcast region; and the repetition rate of the regional media programs is selected to utilize a repeater transmission capacity that would otherwise have been used to transmit the regional media programs intended for reception in the second local broadcast region (claim 17).

Regarding claim 44, Eyer and Marko teach all the imitations of claim 39. Eyer further teaches where the processor filters the signal to pass only the regional media programs intended for reception in the one of the plurality of local broadcast regions by performing the steps of: scanning metadata of the signal for local broadcast identifiers; and comparing the local broadcast identifiers with the local broadcast identifier of the repeater (column 9, lines 1-36, where the IRD identifier is identified with the data that includes the identifier of the local region (IRD) that corresponds to it for delivery).

Regarding claim 46, Eyer and Marko teach all the imitations of claim 39. Eyer further teaches where the repeater transmitter further transmits the local broadcast

identifier to receivers disposed in the local broadcast region (column 8, lines 43-63, where in order to know what data corresponds to each region an identifier is required; e.g., "region identifying data").

Regarding claim 53, Eyer and Marko teach all the limitations of claim 52. Eyer further teaches where the first signal further comprises electronic program guide (EPG) information, and where the system further comprises a receiver having an EPG data module for generating an integrated EPG having the national media programs and only the regional media programs intended for reception in the determined broadcast region (figure 4, e.g., items 400 and 405).

Regarding claim 54, Eyer and Marko teach all the limitations of claim 52. Eyer further teaches where a receiver, disposed in the local broadcast region (figure 1, where receiver 13 is in one of the local broadcast areas), the receiver comprising: a tuner module for receiving the second signal from the terrestrial repeater (figure 1, item 155 receives information from 140, which is terrestrial base), a location module, for determining the local broadcast region (figure 1, item 185).

6. Claims 55 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyer et al. (Eyer, US Patent no.: 6,160 545 A) in view of and Marko and further in view of Alewine et al (Alewine, US Patent No.: 6,564,143 B1).

Regarding claim 55, Eyer and Marko teach all the limitations of claim 54.

Eyer and Marko teach do not explicitly teach where the location module comprises: a global positioning system (GPS) receiver, for providing receiver position



information; and a memory, for storing information relating receiver position information to the local broadcast region.

In related art concerning a method and apparatus for personalizing static and temporal location based services, Alewine teaches where the location module comprises: a global positioning system (GPS) receiver, for providing receiver position information; and a memory, for storing information relating receiver position information to the local broadcast region (column 1, lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Eyer's and Marko's localized delivery system and Alewine's gps in order to provide information according to where the receiver is located, as taught by Alewine.

Regarding claim 56, Eyer and Marko teach all the limitations of claim 54.

Eyer and Marko teach do not specifically teach where the location module comprises: a radio broadcast data system (RDBS) compliant tuner for receiving information indicating the local broadcast information.

Alewine teaches where the location module comprises: a radio broadcast data system (RDBS) compliant tuner for receiving information indicating the local broadcast information (column 1, lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Eyer's and Marko's localized delivery system and Alewine's gps in order to provide information according to where the receiver is located, as taught by Alewine.

***Conclusion***

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angelica Perez whose telephone number is 571-272-7885. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 a.m. - 1:30 p.m., Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either the PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

Art Unit: 2618

for unpublished applications is available through the Private PAIR only. For more information about the pair system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Information regarding Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system can be found at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2600's customer service number is 703-306-0377.

/P. M. A./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2618

May 14, 2008

/Matthew D. Anderson/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618